



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,205	08/07/2006	Alexander Kadyshevitch	40006317-0060-002	5469
57605	7590	01/05/2009	EXAMINER	
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.			KARLSEN, ERNEST F	
C/O SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 061080			2829	
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER				
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/05/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,205	KADYSHEVITCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERNEST F. KARLSEN	2829	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15,31 and 33-37 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15,31 and 33-37 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12082005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

The restriction requirement of September 15, 2008 is withdrawn due to cancellation of the non-elected claims.

Claims 1-15, 31 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The meaning of relative terms "high" and "large" appearing in claim 1 and some dependents is unclear.

Claims 1-15, 31 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It is not clear from the disclosure how the limitation of claim 1, line 8 would be accomplished. If a flood beam covered a thousand holes and all were good then one thousandth of the current would flow through each hole. If one hole allowed no current and each of the remaining holes allowed one thousandth plus one thousandth of one thousandth of the current to flow how would the bad hole be sensed. The total current would be the same as that sensed for all good holes but there would, in fact, be one bad hole. In addition why would it be desirable to provide an indication of at least one defective hole if there were no defective holes?

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada (6,897,440). With regard to claim 1, Yamada '440 discloses in columns 38-40 and Figure 35 that beam pass current from plural holes in each of plural blocks is measured to indicate which blocks have holes with some kind of problem. Yamada '440 says nothing about "at least one hole" but if one hole is defective it would inherently be found. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 13 and 31 are considered inherent in the apparatus of Yamada '440. The trench of claim 11 is a hole.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada '440. Yamada '440 was discussed above, but does not mention standards for comparison. Standard procedures for comparison include comparing to a known good, a reference value, measured values of known good devices, calculated values that are desired and golden devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used any of the above comparison techniques in the apparatus of Yamada '440 because one of ordinary skill would realize that comparison would have too be made to obtain a useable result. The use of "golden" is

usually used in relation to a device specially constructed for comparison purposes and is well known in the art.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Those patents cited but not applied are cited to show prior art similar to that of Yamada '440.

The U.S. prepubs listed on the IDS of December 8, 2005 have been crossed out because the numbers are wrong. U.S. prepubs are identified by 11 digits. Note that patents issuing from the prepubs have been cited by the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERNEST F. KARLSEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1961. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hrs. Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ernest F. Karlsen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2829